Exchange Board of India (SEBI) had undertaken inspection of some Registrars to the Issue and examined public/rights issue of several companies, from which it revealed that the following companies had made improper allotment of shares under "Employees quota" by alloting shares to persons who were not their employees:—

1. M/s. Tata Timkin Ltd.
2. M/s. Ceeta Polymers Ltd.
3. M/s. IFGL Refractories Ltd.
4. M/s. Woolworth (India) Ltd.
5. M/s. Indian Acrylics Ltd.
6. M/s. Maharaja International Ltd.
7. M/s. Daurala Organics Ltd.
8. M/s. Ram Papers Mills Ltd.
9. M/s. Phoenix Electric (I) Ltd.
10. M/s. Maharashtra Seamless Ltd.
11. M/s. Tri veni Pool Intairdril Ltd.
12. M/s. Intron Ltd.
13. M/s. Arrow Webtex Ltd.
14. M/s. Venus Sugars Ltd.
15. M/s. Gujarat Industries Powers Company Ltd.
16. M/s. Pashupati Aerylon Ltd.

In the matter of M/s. Tata Timkin Ltd., Ceeta Polymers Ltd. and IFGL Refractories Ltd. prosecutions under Sections 63 and 68 A of the Companies Act, 1956 were filed. Prosecution was also filed in the case of M/s. Woolworth (India) Ltd. under Section 68A of the Act. On further consideration, it was felt that no sustainable prosecution lies under these provisions of law and, accordingly, the prosecutions were withdrawn. The Government is making suitable legislative amendment, in this behalf.

Amendment in the Representation of Peoples Act

587. SHRI JAGIR SINGH DARD: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are actively considering to make certain amendments in the Representation of Peoples Act in the near future; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.R. BHARD-WAJ): (a) and (b) No specific amendments in the Representation of the People Acts are under the active consideration of the Government. However, as and when proposals for Electoral Reforms are finalised, necessary amendments to the two Representation of the People Acts will be made.

Collection of Huge Funds from Public on False Promises

588. DR. YELAMANCHILISIVAJI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) What is the number of private companies collecting funds from the Public promissing to grow teak wood, sandal wood, horticulture, floriculture, etc. assuring huge returns;

(b) if so,whether these activities are legitimate; and

(c) what is the total amount collected?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.R. BHARD-WAJ): (a) to (c) Several companies have been registered for carrying on the business of plantations and other agroforestry operations. However, information relating to such companies is not centrally compiled. These companies have advertised certain schemes offering ownership of fully grown trees at the end of investment period of 15 to 20 years. The MRTP Commission, on the basis of the several applications and preliminary investigation reports submitted by the Director General of Investigation and Registration, has instituted enquiries against some companies for alleged unfair trade practices.

Vacancies of Judges and pending cases in Punjab and Haryana High Court

589. SHRI VIRENDRA KATARIA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) how many vacancies of Judges are there in Punjab and Haryana High Court;

(b) how many cases are lying pending in that High Court;

(c) what steps are being taken to appoint Judges to fill up the vacancies and whether any more Judges are required to deal with the pending cases; and

(d) the reasons for inordinate delay in appointing Judges and disposal of cases?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) As on 16-2-94 there were 2 vacanies of permanent Judges and 5 vacancies of Additional Judges in the Punjab and Haryana High Court.

(b) As on 30-9-93, 1,20,574 cases were pending in the Punjab and Haryana High Court.

(c) and (d) The process of consultation among the Constitutional authorities for filling up the vacancies of Judges/ Additional Judges in the Punjab and Haryana High Court is on. The Government have also decided to create 4 more posts of permanent Judges and 3 posts of Additional Judges in the Punjab and Haryana High Court in addition to the sanctioned strength of 33 Permanent/ Additional Judges.

Setting up of High Court Benches

590. SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the details of benches of the High Courts set up in different parts of the country during the last three years and the date of setting up of the benches;

(b) whether it is a fact that there is a growing demand to set up more such benches; if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether it is also a fact that lawyers are agitating for the setting up of such benches of High Courts, if so, the details thereof;

(d) whether any commission was set up in the past to go into setting up of High Court benches in different parts of the country;

(e) if so, what were its specific recommenda tions and the action taken on each recommenda tions;

(f) whether any steps are being taken by Government to bring justice at door- step of the comman man in the near future; and

(g) if so, the steps taken in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) During the last three years, two permanent High Court Benches were established, one at Imphal in Manipur with effect from 21.1.1992 and another at Agartala in Tripura with effect from 16.5.1992.

(b) and (c) The information regarding demands made from time to time by different bodies, including lawyers, asking for the establishment of High Court Benches at places away from their principal seats, is given in the attached Statement, *(see* below).

(d) The Government had set up the Jaswant Singh Commission to consider the demands for the constitution of Benches of Allahabad, Gauhati, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Madras High Courts and also the general question of having Benches of High Courts away from their principal seats and the broad principles and criteria to be followed in this regards.

(e) The Commission in its report submitted in April, 1985, recommended establishment of Benches of the High Courts of Allahabad, Madhya Pradesh and Madras at Agra, Raipur and Madurai respectively. The Commission *inter alia* made recommendations on the general question of having Benches of the High Courts at places away from their principal seats and broad principles and criteria to be followed in regard thereto. The Commission could not report on the demand for establishment of Benches of Gauhati and Karnataka High Courts.

The specific recommendations of the Commission for establishment of Benches of the High Courts of Allahabad, Madhya Pradesh and Madras were referred to the Governments of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu respectively in October, 1986 for their views and comments in consultation with the Chief Justices of the respective High Courts. The report of the Commission, on the general question of having Benches of the High Courts was sent to all the State Governments and the High Courts for their information and guidance in September, 1987.

(0 and (g) With a view *inter alia* to bring justice at the doorstep of the common man, the Government requested the 11th Law Commission to study the problems of Judicial Reforms and made its recommendations. The Commi-